

The opinion in support of the order being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 21

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

**Ex parte JARON Z. LANIER, JEAN-JACQUES G. GRIMAUD, YOUNG L. HARVILL,
CHUCK L. BLANCHARD, MARK L. OBERMAN and MICHAEL A. TEITEL**

MAILED

Appeal No. 2002-0475

Application No. 09/217,595

MAY - 6 2002

ORDER

**PAT. & T.M. OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Before STONER, Chief Administrative Patent Judge, HARKCOM, Vice Chief
Administrative Patent Judge, and NASE, Administrative Patent Judge.

NASE, Administrative Patent Judge.

This is an order under 37 CFR § 1.196(d). 37 CFR § 1.196(d) provides:

The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences may require appellant to address any matter that is deemed appropriate for a reasoned decision on the pending appeal. Appellant will be given a non-extendable time period within which to respond to such a requirement.

BACKGROUND

One issue on appeal is whether claims 31 to 94 have been properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based.

The appellants filed their amended appeal brief on May 14, 2001 (Paper No. 19).

The case of Pannu v. Storz Instruments, Inc., 258 F.3d 1366, 59 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2001), was decided on July 25, 2001.

In Pannu the Court in discussing the recapture rule stated that "[o]n reissue, [patentee] is estopped from attempting to recapture the precise limitation [patentee] added to overcome prior art rejections." 258 F.3d at 1372, 59 USPQ2d at 1601.

Another issue raised on page 3 of the examiner's answer (Paper No. 20, mailed January 29, 2002) is whether claims 1 to 94 are properly rejectable under 35 U.S.C. § 251 as being based on a defective reissue oath.¹

¹ This issue was not specifically raised in the final rejection (Paper No. 14, mailed June 19, 2000).

ORDER

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.196(d), the appellants are required to file a Supplemental Appeal Brief to address the impact the Pannu decision has on the rejection before us in this appeal and to respond to the rejection of claims 1 to 94 under 35 U.S.C. § 251 as being based on a defective reissue oath.

The appellants are given a non-extendable time period of **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this order for response thereto. Failure to respond within this **TWO MONTH** time period will result in the dismissal of the appeal.


BRUCE H. STONER, JR.
Chief Administrative Patent Judge

R. BRUCE H. STONER, JR.
Chief Administrative Patent Judge

~~GARY V. HARKCOM~~
Vice Chief Administrative Patent Judge

JEFFREY V. NASE
Administrative Patent Judge

Appeal No. 2002-0475
Application No. 09/217,595

4

CONLEY ROSE AND TAYON
P O BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

JVN/tdl